

REMARKS

The above amendments and these remarks are responsive to the Final Office Action issued on June 21, 2006. By this Response, claims 1-92 are cancelled without prejudice, and claims 93-140 are newly presented. No new matter is added. Claims 93-140 are now active for examination. A request for continued examination and a petition for a three-month extension of time are submitted concurrently herewith.

The Office Action and the Telephone Interview

The Office Action rejected claims 1-25, 27, 29-41, 43-66, 72, 73 and 75-90 under 35 U.S.C. §101. Claims 23-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Claims 87-90 stood rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1-12, 23, 24, 29, 31, 43-54 and 65-76 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Bishop (U.S. Patent No. 5,810,599). Claims 91 and 92 stood rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bishop (U.S. Patent No. 5,810,599).

The Examiner is thanked for the courtesy for a telephone interview conducted on October 17, 2006, to discuss a proposed amendment to claim 1 and how the amended claim overcomes the outstanding rejections. The Examiner agreed that the claim, after the proposed amendment, would overcome all the outstanding rejections including rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101 and 35 U.S.C. §102, and encouraged Applicants to incorporate the same amendment into other independent claims to overcome the rejections. The Examiner further suggested presenting the amended claims in the form of new claims, for easier review of the claims.

By this Response, new claims incorporating the proposed amendment are presented according to the Examiner's suggestion. Per the discussion of the telephone interview, the claims are now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Claim 93, which substantially tracks descriptions of original claims and incorporates the proposed amendment discussed during the interview, describes allowing a user to select and access to a specific description perspective of an event. A selection is provided to solicit a user selection of a description perspective being one of a perspective of a first individual in the dialog, a perspective of a second individual in the dialog, and a narration of the dialog. The user selection is received, and a description of the event is presented according to the selected description perspective. Appropriate support for claim 93 can be found in, for instance, Figure 1, reference numerals 114-117 and paragraph [0049] of the written description.

In contrast, although Bishop discusses providing a transcription 132 or a translation 134 of an audio-visual work in windows 126 or 128, the transcription or the translation is a transcript of both parties in the dialog. Bishop does not (1) provide a selection to solicit a user selection of a description perspective being one of a perspective of a first individual in the dialog, a perspective of a second individual in the dialog, and a narration of the dialog, and (2) present a description of the dialog according to the selected description perspective. Accordingly, claim 92 is patentable over Bishop.

Claims 94-104, directly or indirectly, depend on claim 93 and incorporate every limitation thereof. Claims 94-104 closely track features describe in original claims 2-22 and other features described in the application. Appropriate support can be found in, for example, original claims 2-22, Figures 1 and 3, paragraphs [0024]-[0027], [0031], [0034]-[0040] and

[0049]. No new matter is added. It is submitted that claims 94-104 are patentable over the documents of record by virtue of their dependencies. Favorable consideration of claims 94-104 is respectfully requested.

Independent claims 105, 117, 129 and their respective dependent claims are software, system and means-plus-function claims and include descriptions substantially similar to those of claims 94-104. Accordingly, claims 105-140 are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as for claims 94-104. Favorable consideration of claims 105-140 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

For the reasons given above, Applicants believe that this application is conditioned for allowance and request that the Examiner give the application favorable reconsideration and permit it to issue as a patent. However, if the Examiner believes that the application can be put in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative listed below.

Application No.: 10/652,620

Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Wei-Chen Chen". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a horizontal line extending from the end.

Wei-Chen Nicholas Chen
Registration No. 56,665

18191 Von Karman Avenue, St. 500
Irvine, CA 92612-7108
Phone 949-851-0633 WNC/pab
Facsimile: 949-851-9348
Date: December 8, 2006

MPK 117965-3.076729.0012

**Please recognize our Customer No. 31824
as our correspondence address.**